

**MINUTES**  
*of the*  
**Mental Health Planning Advisory Council**  
*meeting on*  
**August 26, 2002**  
*held at*  
Department of Human Resources  
Conference Room  
Kinkead Building, Room 601  
505 E King Street  
Carson City, NV 89701

**I. CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, INTRODUCTIONS**

Alyce Thomas, Chair of the Council, called the meeting to order at 10:35 am.

Members present:

- |                    |                     |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| • Aitken, Nancy    | • Doyle, Mike       |
| • Bennett, Bob     | • Jackson, Barbara  |
| • Clark, Jerry     | • Johnson, Rosetta  |
| • Caloiaro, Dave   | • Legier, Barbara   |
| • Crowe, Kevin     | • Parra, Debbie     |
| • Cooley, Judge W. | • Rodriguez, Jenita |
| • DeJan, Emil      | • Thomas, Alyce     |
| • Dopf, Gloria     | • Uptergrove, Anna  |

Members absent:

- Taycher, Karen

Staff and others in attendance:

- |                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| • Brandenburg, Carlos – MHDS | • O'Brien, Elizabeth – MHDS                  |
| • Lesquereux, Kelly – MHDS   | • Zeiser, Andrew – Administrative Consultant |

## **II. PRESENTATION OF COUNCIL RECOGNITION AWARDS TO MHDS STAFF**

Alyce Thomas asked Kevin Crowe to make the presentation of Council appreciation awards to Elizabeth O'Brien and Kelly Lesquereux, who are both part of the Division of Mental Health and Developmental Services' (MHDS) fiscal staff. Kevin commended Liz and Kelly for their hard work to implement the fiscal processes necessary to fund a variety of programs and administrative services with Block Grant funds.

Gloria Dopf then asked that the Council members introduce themselves individually to Liz and Kelly. The members did so, then thanked them for their support of the Council.

## **III. FY 2003 CONSUMER SERVICES PROPOSAL REVIEW**

Alyce Thomas asked Andrew Zeiser to briefly go over the consumer services proposal review process. Andrew explained the changes to the process based on Gloria Dopf's requests during the proposal review last year: 1) A discussion item on the agenda before scores are finalized; 2) Addition of a yes/no score sheet question about whether or not members believe a proposal should be funded; and 3) A the option to recommend a reduced award amount.

Alyce then brought up the topic of conflict of interest and explained that if any member feels they have such a conflict regarding any of the proposals for funding, they should not score the proposal and should abstain from voting on awards to the specific organizations they may be involved with. Brief questions and discussion followed about what comprises a conflict of interest. Kevin Crowe and Gloria pointed out that if a Council member has any financial interest or potential to gain from a proposal being funded, they should abstain. Nancy brought up the question as to whether she should vote on certain proposals based on her membership in NAMI. Alyce advised Nancy to abstain from scoring and voting on NAMI proposals. Barbara Jackson then brought up her abstention on the Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (NNAMHS) proposal based on her employment with the State of Nevada.

Judge Cooley clarified further by stating that members should guard against the appearance of impropriety in this matter. Gloria then brought up the question as to whether there would be a quorum for voting on the funding if several members abstained. Andrew said only a third of the Council is required for a quorum on votes, and based on the near-full attendance today he does not foresee a problem. More discussion followed. Rosetta Johnson then asked again about conflict of interest. Kevin again reminded the members present that if they are a member of an organization or have any fiscal interest in an organization, they should abstain from scoring and voting on funding for the organization.

Alyce then asked for further discussion. No comments were made. Gloria asked how abstentions will be handled for scoring. Andrew said that each organization's final score would be weighted based on the number of members scoring for each proposal. Alyce requested that each of the members finalize their score sheets and submit them. Andrew then explained that he

would require some time to process the scores and return with the ranked scoring reports. Alyce then called for a break.

*\*\*\* The meeting broke at 11:05 am, then resumed at 12: 05 pm.*

#### **IV. FY 2003 CONSUMER SERVICES PROPOSAL AWARDS**

Alyce Thomas asked Andrew Zeiser to go over the ranked score and recommendation reports. Andrew explained how the scores were figured, pointing out that the score report ranks proposals based on total score, while the recommendation report ranks proposals based on the total number of yes/no funding recommendations made by the Council members. He briefly discussed ways in which the scores might be used to make a decision. Kevin Crowe suggested that the top three on the ranked score report could be decreased by \$1,000 each and thus funded with the \$35,000 available. The top three scored proposals are as follows:

<i><b>Proposal</b></i>	<i><b>Requested Amount</b></i>
1. Mental Health Association (MHA) of Southern Nevada	\$15,000
2. Northern Nevada Adult Mental Health Services (NNAMHS)	\$8,000
3. Nevada Recovery Guide	\$15,000

Jenita Rodriguez then brought up the NNAMHS Canteen proposal and asked about its current status. Alyce paused to read an e-mail update from Pat Merrill, which essentially says that the asbestos abatement will begin this week and Pat foresees that the fiscal year (FY) 2002 award will be expended by September 30, 2002.

Judge Cooley then made a motion based on Kevin's recommendation that each of the top three proposals be awarded amounts reduced by \$1,000, which would total \$35,000.

MOTION: Made Judge W. Cooley, but not seconded, that the top three scored proposals receive award amounts reduced by \$1,000 each.

Bob Bennett interjected to say that he would like to further discuss the budget from the Nevada Recovery Guide proposal. He referred to the line item for communications and said he does not understand the nature of these expenses. Gloria said she believes there appears to be room to reduce the total budget and she recommends an award amount of \$9,000 to \$10,000. Bob proposed reducing it to \$7,000.

Gloria then brought up the difference in the top three of the ranked score report versus the top three of the ranked recommendation report. She pointed out the disparity between the two for the NNAMHS proposal, which scored high but was ranked low for yes/no recommendations. Andrew suggested that the Council members consider one list over the other. Gloria said she thinks the Council needs to consider both lists and make recommendations accordingly. She said she would like to consider the two proposals that are in the top three of both lists: MHA of Southern Nevada and Nevada Recovery Guide.

Nancy Aitken expressed her concern about reducing the Nevada Recovery Guide proposal without discussing it with their staff.

Alyce reiterated Gloria's suggestion that the top two proposals that appear on both lists be funded. Gloria then made a motion accordingly.

MOTION: Made by Gloria Dopf, seconded by Kevin Crowe, to fund the MHA of Southern Nevada and Nevada Recovery Guide proposals.

Alyce asked for discussion. Andrew suggested attaching amounts to the motion. Gloria said she would like to consider amounts in a separate motion. Judge Cooley said she believes that the Council members should consider funding the top three proposals on the ranked score report only. Jerry Clark said that if this is intended to be a competitive process, he also believes the Council should consider the ranked scores only. Mike Doyle said he believes the funding recommendations appear to be more subjective. Gloria pointed out that the motion she put on the table does not preclude the group from basing their decision on the ranked scores.

Judge Cooley said she wants to return to her original motion from above, as well as specify that that Council consider the ranked scores only. Gloria said she would withdraw her motion based on Judge Cooley's motion.

MOTION: Made by Judge Cooley, seconded by Anna Uptergrove, that the Council consider the ranked score report only for determining the proposals to be awarded and that the top three be awarded funds, reduced by \$1,000 each, for a total of \$35,000.

Jenita then recommended that MHA of Southern Nevada and Nevada Recovery Guide proposals be reduced by \$1,500 each so that the NNAMHS proposal can be funded for the full amount. Alyce asked for discussion on this suggestion. Jenita then requested a friendly amendment to Judge Cooley's motion to reduce \$1,500 from the two proposals as referenced above. Judge Cooley indicated her acceptance of the friendly amendment. Gloria asked if the member who seconded the motion agrees. Ann indicated her agreement.

MOTION: Made by Judge Cooley, seconded by Anna Uptergrove, and amended by Jenita Rodriguez, that the Council consider the ranked score report only for determining the proposals to be awarded and that the top three be awarded funds. The requested amounts from the MHA of Southern Nevada and Nevada Recovery Guide will be reduced by \$1,500 each and the requested amount from NNAMHS will be awarded in full, for a total of \$35,000.

Alyce asked for more discussion. No further comments were made. Andrew recommended that an individual voice vote be taken if the Council members are comfortable with this. The members agreed. Alyce then called for the vote.

VOTE IN FAVOR: Nancy Aitken, Dave Caloiaro, Jerry Clark, Judge W. Cooley, Emil DeJan, Mike Doyle, Barbara Legier, Debbie Parra, and Jenita Rodriguez.

VOTE OPPOSED: Bob Bennett

VOTES ABSTAINED: Kevin Crowe, Gloria Dopf, Barbara Jackson, Rosetta Johnson, Alyce Thomas, and Anna Uptergrove.

MAJORITY VOICE VOTE; MOTION CARRIED.

Alyce followed up by asking for discussion on the proposal review and award process, noting that she does not believe the process went as smoothly this year. Andrew noted his concern that a discussion item was specifically set for finalization of scores based on last year's process, but the Council did not appear to need this time. Additionally, lunch was scheduled to allow for score processing and this time was offset by the lack of discussion under item three of the agenda.

Judge Cooley suggested that the ranking be completed in advance and then discussion be scheduled at the award meeting, which would allow for score changes to be made only if needed based on the discussion at the meeting. Bob said he believes there is a need for roundtable discussion of each of the proposals individually. He also recommended getting feedback from the applicants directly.

Dave said he thinks it would be good to look at the ranking separately from the funding. Jerry said that if applicants are invited to appear in-person to answer questions from the Council, they would all have to be invited and given equal time. In response to Bob's comments, Alyce said that she asked questions individually of the applicants by contacting them after she reviewed the proposals, noting that their contact information was specifically requested in the request for proposal (RFP).

Gloria said that because of the size of the Council it does not seem appropriate to have up to 17 people calling an individual applicant. Andrew discussed three options for proposal review that he is aware of through his work with other state groups: 1) Make award decisions based solely on what is presented in the paper-based proposal; 2) Conduct in-person interviews of each applicant; and 3) Compile questions from Council members that are faxed in a group to each applicant requesting that written responses be submitted back to the Council. Andrew explained that in-person interviews are both time consuming and resource intensive to conduct. He said that compiling questions for applicants and requesting written responses might be a happy medium for the Council.

Jenita suggested that just the proposals be considered. Gloria said she believes that the paper-based proposal does not communicate the entire picture, noting that proposals may be well written but not adequately reflect the proposed program as a whole. This is why she wanted something more than just the ranked score report because a proposal may be well written and receive a high score, but it may not be worthwhile to fund. Gloria said she would prefer to have some system by which the Council can discuss the proposals. Judge Cooley suggested compiling questions for the individual applicants and discussing the responses as a group prior to finalizing subgrant awards. Bob and Gloria agreed this would be a good idea.

Rosetta said that when she worked on grant applications at the United Way, they conducted interviews of the individual applicants, which was followed group discussion. Alyce said she does not believe it is a good use of Council time and resources to invite the applicants for individual interviews because of the small amount of funds awarded. Rosetta asked if the available funding would increase in future years. Alyce said that Nevada can probably look forward to a small percentage increase based on past grant increases. Rosetta asked if the Council could limit the number of applications received. Alyce said she believes this would be unfair and that consumer services funding needs to remain an open, competitive process.

Dave said he agrees with parts of the feedback offered. He brought up the new requirement in this year's RFP for applicants to submit letters of reference, which is a way to get feedback without taking the time for in-person interviews. Dave said he does not believe the Council should have to pay for applicants to travel to attend the meeting to conduct interviews.

Judge Cooley summarized by saying that she believes there are two primary questions to consider: 1) Does the Council want to revise the scoring process for next year? 2) How does the Council want to revise this process?

Bob said he believes that sending compiled questions out is a good compromise. Gloria suggested removing the yes/no component of scoring and relying on the answers to the compiled questions as applicant feedback. Bob made a motion accordingly.

MOTION: Made by Bob Bennett, seconded by Gloria Dopf, that for the FY 2004 RFP and subgrant award process the Council will only consider a ranked score report and not include a yes/no component as part of scoring process. Additionally, the Council will implement a question and response process for members to get additional information from applicants prior to the award process.

Alyce asked for discussion. No additional comments were made. She then called for a vote.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE; MOTION CARRIED.

Kevin then brought up the need to initiate more contact with award recipients. He suggested contacting subgrantees both at beginning of process and at the end of the process. Judge Cooley suggested requesting quarterly written reports from the recipients, with in-person appearances requested mid-way and/or at the end of the grant period. Alyce also suggested that update information could be obtained from MHDS fiscal staff on subgrant expenditures.

Jerry Clark said he would like to see the Council make a greater effort to obtain proposals focused on children's mental health. Kevin asked if Jerry has any suggestions as to how to do this. Jerry suggested sending the RFP to children's organizations. Alyce asked Council members to submit the names and addresses of individuals and organizations to whom the RFP should go. Kevin suggested that the Council could target the RFP to children's services. Alyce said she believes this is not fair and it should be open to all applicants.

Alyce then called for a lunch break. Some members requested that the Council work through until the end of the agenda. Alyce pointed out that lunch was scheduled on the agenda. Dave suggested that the Council try to reconvene by 1:30 pm. The members agreed.

*\*\*\* The meeting broke at 1:10 pm, then resumed at 1:40 pm.*

## **V. SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATES**

### ***Bylaw Review Subcommittee***

Alyce Thomas began by asking Judge Cooley and Dave Caloiaro to begin their review of proposed bylaw changes. Dave distributed two documents: 1) bylaws with proposed revisions and 2) a proposed grievance form. Dave pointed out that recommended changes appear in italics. He then reviewed all of the proposed changes, specifically going over the new grievance procedure and form. He then asked Judge Cooley if she has any additional comments. Judge Cooley complimented Dave on his presentation.

Alyce then asked the Council members to provide any additional feedback regarding changes to Andrew Zeiser, who will then forward the information to the Subcommittee for review. Jenita Rodriguez said she does not think the word ‘consecutive’ should be added to the absences language, but rather it should say ‘within a year.’ Emil DeJan asked why the grievance committee is not identical to the Executive Committee. He believes it should be this way. Alyce asked Emil and Jenita to submit their suggested changes in writing. Emil asked that his suggestion be recorded in the minutes.

Mike Doyle noted that increasing from 17 to 21 members will have a financial impact on the Council budget. Rosetta asked about the makeup of the Council members who are not State employees and said that she believes there is not enough representation from the rural areas. She asked if the bylaws should specifically state that the Council will seek rural representation. Alyce said that she has previously attempted to recruit members from the rural areas but it has been difficult to get responses. She suggested that rural members, if successfully recruited, may have to participate via teleconference. She said she will continue to make efforts to obtain rural representation. Mike said it is the intent of the Council to do this but the group should not tie itself to this in the bylaws.

Emil said it is his experience that there is interest in the rural areas. Jenita asked if applications can be submitted now for the new positions. Alyce recommended waiting to solicit them in order to maintain the interest of applicants, without making them wait too long to hear back from the Council. She said she does not want to lose people.

Kevin followed up by asking about the projected timeline for this change. Alyce said first the bylaws have to change, then a request has to be sent to the Governor’s office, then a response has to be received. She foresees this may take until the middle of next year, particularly given the upcoming Legislative session.

Judge Cooley said she would like to make a motion that the Council accept the draft of the proposed bylaw changes.

MOTION: Made by Judge Cooley, seconded by Jenita Rodriguez, that the Council accept the draft of the proposed bylaw changes with the understanding that members are able to make additional recommendations for changes for consideration and approval at the next scheduled meeting.

Alyce then asked for discussion. No additional comments were made.

UNANIMOUS VOICE VOTE; MOTION CARRIED.

### ***Legislative Subcommittee***

Alyce asked Jenita to begin her report. Jenita said that Anna Uptergrove met with Carlos Brandenburg and Ed Cotton, and she will be scheduling meetings with them also. Jenita said she understands that Carlos's biggest concern is gaps in service. She also brought up the issue of legally recognizing mental health advanced directives in Nevada. Jenita said she has spoken with Assemblywoman Sheila Leslie and Senator Randolph Townsend about this initiative and they support it. Dave Caloiaro commented on the need for specific provisions in advanced directives related to mental illness, particularly centered around end-of-life issues. Alyce said she also has information from the National Mental Health Association (NMHA) that she can provide. Jenita said she has some examples of bill draft requests (BDRs) for mental health advanced directives from Arizona.

Rosetta asked about the content of the advanced directives. What are they for? Jenita said there are several different formats that can be considered. Some have to do with forms of therapy and treatment such as electroconvulsive therapy (ECT). Rosetta asked about people who do not acknowledge their mental illness and how they will be educated about advanced directives. Alyce and Barbara Jackson said that ideally, a format for mental health advanced directives would go out to existing clients within the system. More discussion followed. Rosetta brought up the fact that some advanced directives are contested. Barbara said that she believes the ability to complete an advanced directive is a basic right, and that it is very important to enable persons with serious mental illness (SMI) to make these kinds of decisions. Jenita pointed out that the ideal would be to put mental health advanced directives in place alongside medical advanced directives.

Dave said that right or wrong, a framework needs to be created in which mental health advanced directives can be put in place and a person can be named to make decisions on behalf of someone who is incapacitated. The goal is that while persons with mental illness are in a rational place, they can make decisions about both medical and mental health treatment they might refuse in the future.



Rosetta again asked about the Council members' view of persons who will not access treatment because they are not capable of seeing their own need for treatment. Rosetta then said she believes that she should be able to express her views even if they are counter to those of others in the group. Alyce said she does not believe anyone is unfairly criticizing Rosetta's viewpoint. Rosetta reiterated that she does not believe some people are capable of making rational decisions about receiving treatment. Barbara said that she believes that everyone has a right, as a human being, to determine whether they receive treatment. Rosetta said she believes this is not appropriate in severe cases.

Judge Cooley said her understanding is that Rosetta's original question was what the opinion of the Council is regarding this matter, and said that she believes the members should contribute their ideas in writing and build consensus at a later meeting. Rosetta said again that she feels her comments were not well received by the group. Judge Cooley said it would be appropriate for Rosetta to differentiate between her personal views versus speaking on behalf of the Council. In the case of her personal opinions, of course it is her right to express these opinions and the Council should respect them as a personal viewpoint. In the case of speaking on behalf of the Council, she believes the group needs to reach a consensus as discussed above. Bob Bennett pointed out that there are various types of advanced directives and the intent is for persons who are functioning well at a given time to give direction about future treatment.

Andrew then clarified that the focus of the BDR is to have advanced directives legally recognized, not to determine their content or who will execute them. Jenita agreed. Alyce said that her hope for the Council is that all opinions will be valued and recognized within the group. She also said that the Council has not developed a formal position on this topic, along with several others, in order to support or not support a BDR. Alyce said she does not want Rosetta to feel attacked and that everyone in the group has the right to express their opinions on the matter.

Kevin moved on to ask how the Legislative Subcommittee will link with MHDS. Jenita said she will be meeting with Carlos to discuss this. Kevin suggested that information about when bills are heard should be communicated to the Council. Alyce asked if this information could be communicated to Andrew, who could then distribute it to the group. Kevin said yes.

Rosetta asked how the Subcommittee identified mental health advanced directives as a topic. Alyce said she sees this as a priority among many national consumer groups. Jenita said it was also brought up at the last Council meeting. Rosetta asked how specific issues will be communicated to the Subcommittee. Jenita said again she will be meeting with Carlos Brandenburg and Ed Cotton.

Judge Cooley then made a motion to accept the Legislative Subcommittee report as submitted and conclude the discussion.

**MOTION:** Made by Judge Cooley, seconded by Kevin Crowe, to accept the Legislative Subcommittee report as submitted by Jenita Rodriguez.

No vote was called by the Chair.

## ***Website Subcommittee***

Kevin distributed a one-page summary of MHDS website development, including the Council's home page. He pointed out that if Council members believe certain information should be placed on the site, they can contact the MHDS webmaster, Rosie Cevalasco. Kevin then brought up whether addresses and contact information for Council members would be included on the site. Andrew said he specifically submitted names only to Rosie, and not contact information for individual Council members, because he felt it was not appropriate to release personal information without consulting with the members first. The members agreed they do not want their personal contact information on the site. Alyce suggested that the Council's main number be used instead.

Kevin then brought up the possibility of including pictures of the Council members on the site. Several members indicated they do not want their individual pictures to appear on the site. Alyce suggested a group picture. Again, several members expressed hesitation at having any pictures on the site. Kevin concluded by suggesting that Council members review the site and provide feedback prior to the next meeting. Judge Cooley noted that the website would be a good place to advertise the annual RFP.

## ***MHDS Strategic Plan Subcommittee***

Kevin said that the MHDS Strategic Plan is still being developed and it may be available for review prior to or at the next meeting.

## **VI. EXECUTIVE REPORT**

### ***Ticket to Work***

Alyce Thomas began by reporting that she is no longer the Chair of this task force. She noted that an important component of the work of the group is the Medicaid Infrastructure Grant. Alyce provided some detail about how the tickets are supposed to be used and implemented. She then discussed the challenges faced by people who return to work and lose social supports such as supportive living arrangements (SLAs), food stamps, prescriptions, etc.

Kevin Crowe asked about employer networks. Alyce said none have been approved in Nevada yet. Kevin confirmed that even if someone has a ticket, there is no one to give it to. Alyce agreed and said this is currently the key problem. Kevin asked why no employers have entered the network. Alyce said that many do not have the resources to make expenditures and then wait for reimbursement on the tickets, which may take up to five months.

## ***Juvenile Justice Commission***

Alyce brought up the need for mental health representation on the Commission and the need for addressing mental health needs when juveniles are transitioned out facilities upon turning 18. She underscored the need to start early and start smart to address mental health needs. She also emphasized the problem of jails being used as holding facilities for persons with mental illness.

## ***Las Vegas Homeless Task Force***

Alyce said this group may dissolve because MASH Village in Las Vegas is closing. However, staff members from this organization are applying for the HOPE grant, which may allow for their continued operation. Bob Bennett then submitted information to Alyce on a technical assistance opportunity pertaining to juvenile justice. More discussion followed about the HOPE grant, which is designed to provide services to the homeless and will be administered by MHDS.

## ***Consumer Assistance Program (CAP)***

Alyce briefly discussed who has been hired to date and indicated that the Carson City position is still open. She also briefly reviewed some of the initial goals of the program and duties of some of the Consumer Services Assistants (CSAs). Alyce said that initially the response from consumers about the program has been positive.

Dave asked what area the Carson office covers. Alyce and Carlos Brandenburg said just Carson. Other rural areas are covered by different CSAs. Carlos then took a moment to compliment the program and underscored the value it provides as part of Block Grant funded services.

Alyce then brought up the plan to develop a drop-in center in the south, modeled after the program already in place in the north at NNAMHS. She said this includes a variety of recreation activities. Kevin asked about consumer access to computers. She said they are available in the north but this will not be possible right away in the south. Alyce also discussed the inclusion of training opportunities at the drop-in center including self advocacy, independent living skills, literacy, and computer skills.

Barbara Jackson complimented Carlos on the excellent selection of the on site supervisor at NNAMHS, Pat Merrill. She said that Pat has demonstrated a tremendous amount of respect toward the CSAs. She also complimented the other staff at NNAMHS including Harold Cook. More discussion followed.

Carlos then mentioned that MHDS is in the process of submitting budgets to the Governor, and this includes a request for new CSAs. Kevin asked Barbara to speak more about her experience at NNAMHS and brief discussion followed.

## **VII. NEW BUSINESS**

Alyce Thomas began by distributing newspaper articles about the proposed southern inpatient hospital and her response letters to the respective editors of the articles. She asked Carlos Brandenburg to comment on this. He explained that there was a \$15 million surplus from the Department of Corrections that the Governor is proposing be allocated to MHDS to build a new inpatient hospital in the south. Carlos said this is about half of what would be needed to build between a 130- and 190-bed hospital. He noted that when this proposal was put out, it received some criticism. He would like the Council to consider supporting the letters drafted by Alyce and be on record that they support building the new hospital. Carlos noted that MHDS is considering plans for use of the old hospital that include bringing Alzheimer's patients back in state who were previously sent out of state. He then asked if the Council members have any questions. Alyce suggested that other individual members consider writing separate letters also.

Rosetta asked where they would obtain the remaining needed funds. Carlos said that with the Governor's support, he believes the additional funds will be allocated by the Legislature.

Dave Caloiaro then brought up an article that supports the need for both core inpatient services and community-based services. More discussion followed. Rosetta suggested getting quotes from the patients themselves who have benefited from the new Dini-Townsend hospital in the north.

Alyce moved on to discuss a letter from Bob Bennett requesting data from MHDS about restraint and seclusion. Alyce said she wants to make it clear whether the Council wants the information, or whether the Council supports MHDS releasing the data to the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill (NAMI). Alyce then asked Andrew to read the draft of the letter. Nancy Aitken said she does not understand why this has to go through the Council if Bob is trying to obtain this information for NAMI. Bob said he was unclear about this at the last meeting. Alyce suggested that Bob may request the information on his own.

Carlos said he believes the Council should be made aware of this data because the issue of restraint and seclusion is important. He applauds NAMI's efforts to reduce restraint and seclusion. Carlos agreed that the data is confidential information, but that aggregate data might be able to be shared as requested in the letter. He believes this is something the Council may want to work on. More discussion followed. Carlos explained the staff cultural shifts that will be required to reach the goal of zero restraint and seclusion. He believes the support of the Council would help to reach this goal.

Dave asked if the data is being requested for both adults and children, noting that there is national attention on reducing restraint and seclusion for children as well. Bob said the NAMI Committee would like to see both reduced, but they are starting with obtaining adult statistics.

Nancy asked if a letter or other information could be provided by the NAMI Committee to the Council indicating why they want the information.

Alyce asked if there is any additional new business. No other items were put forth.

## **VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT**

No public attendees were present to make comments to the Council.

## **IX. SET DATE, TIME, LOCATION, AND TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETINGS**

Andrew Zeiser asked if the Council would be willing to change the October 22 date set at the previous meeting. Emil DeJan suggested October 24. Various suggested dates followed. Alyce suggested Tuesday, October 29. More discussion followed and the members agreed to October 29 in Reno.

## **XI. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 pm.